DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 817 CE 065 443

AUTHOR Pritchard, May Long
TITLE The State Youth Initiatives Project. State Education and Coordination Grants: The Early Experience. Working Paper #4.
INSTITUTION Public/Private Ventures, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 91p.; For a related document, see ED 304 496.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; *Disadvantaged; Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; *Resource Allocation; Secondary Education; Special Needs Students; Vocational Education; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Job Training Partnership Act 1982

ABSTRACT

A study gathered information from the early 8 percent set-aside experience of 12 states during the first official period of Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) activity. The states were Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, and South Carolina. Findings were that the governor lodged responsibility for 8 percent administration with the state's department of education in one-half of the sample. State vocational education subunits or departments controlled most 8 percent funding in 5 of 12 cases, public secondary education in 3 cases, and employment and training interests in 4. Sample states relied on four methods to distribute their 80 percent service monies: Request for Proposals, allocation by needs-based formulas, sole-source contracting, and a mix. Largely at their own discretion, 8 percent agencies used 20 percent funds designated for support of coordination activities primarily for administrative purposes and technical assistance. Four sample states had not targeted a specific population beyond the terms of JTPA, leaving the responsibility for selection of special-needs groups with local areas. Three-fourths of sample states identified youth education services as a major focus of 8 percent programming. Problems were the amount of time and overcoming CETA mindsets. (A final section contains state profiles highlighting 8 percent policy and programming in each survey state.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 817

P/PV

Public/Private Ventures

399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 592-9099

The State Youth Initiatives Project

Working Paper #4

State Education and Coordination Grants: The Early Experience

by May Long Pritchard

Spring 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 065 443

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public/Private Ventures Board of Directors

Rex D. Adams
General Manager
Employee Relations
Mobil Oil Corporation
New York, New York

Alan Campbell
Vice Chairman
ARA Services, Inc.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Edwin D. Campbell
Executive Vice President
National Alliance of Business
Washington, D.C.

Walter D'Alessio
President & Chief Executive Officer
Latimer and Buck
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Nolen Ellison
President
Cuyahoga Community College
Cleveland, Ohio

Sol Hurwitz
Senior Vice President
Committee for Economic Development
New York, New York

Katharine C. Lyall
Vice President, Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin System
Madison, Wisconsin

Arabella Martinez
Arabella Martinez Institute
Washington, D.C.

Steven A. Minter
Director
The Cleveland Foundation
Cleveland, Ohio

Ersa H. Poston
Personnel Management Consultant
McLean, Virginia

William J. Spring
Consultant to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
Boston, Massachusetts

Anita A. Summers
Chairperson, Department of Public Policy and Management
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Alfred M. Zuck
Executive Director
National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
Washington, D.C.

Michael A. Bailin
President

Public/Private Ventures (P/PV) is a national, not-for-profit corporation that seeks effective approaches to job training and education for disadvantaged citizens. P/PV designs and manages demonstration projects, conducts program evaluations, and provides technical assistance to others. Its work is supported by funds from both the public and private sectors.

This paper is one in a series produced by P/PV with the support of The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. The Mott papers are designed to provide information on state policies and programs that serve disadvantaged youth. P/PV's other state-related activities include its work with state governments through a national demonstration project, State Employment Initiatives for Youth.

A list of publications and further information about P/PV are available from: The Resource Center, Public/Private Ventures, 399 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pa., 19106. Telephone: 215-592-9099.

P/PV

Public/Private Ventures

399 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106
(215) 592-9099

The State Youth Initiatives Project

Working Paper #4

State Education and Coordination Grants: The Early Experience

by May Long Pritchard

Spring 1984

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

1. Overview 5

2. Agency Administration 7

3. Methods of Distribution 14

4. Target Population. 23

5. Program Emphases 27

6. Problem Areas. 29

7. Effecting Coordination 34

8. Conclusion 36

9. State Profiles 39

Table Listing

Table 1	8% Agency Administration	8
Table 2	Relationship between JTPA 8% and CETA set-aside responsibility	10-11
Table 3	80 Percent Distribution Procedures	16
Table 4	20 Percent Distribution Procedures	21
Table 5	Target Population and Program Emphases	24-25
Table 6	State Administrative Changes Prompted by JTPA	30
Table 7	8% Project Implementation	32

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to Susan M. Christian for her help with the interviews and collection of information. Her astute observations contributed significantly to the substance of this paper. Carol Thomson, P/PV's Director of Communications and Public Affairs, edited the paper with her usual care and thoughtfulness. Laura Levin, a Program Officer with P/PV, provided useful, incisive comments concerning its organization and substance. Donna Brown typed the several drafts with unflagging patience.

I am grateful as well to JTPA 8% staff in the survey states for their time, help, and patience. Without their cooperation, so graciously given, this paper would not have been possible. Finally, The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation has our continued thanks for its support of this series of papers on state initiatives for youth.

INTRODUCTION

In October, 1983, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) replaced the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) as the primary legislation shaping federal employment and training policy. Among the innovations contained in the new law is the State Education Coordination and Grants set-aside. This provision places 8 percent of each state's total allocation for Training for Disadvantaged Youth and Adults (Title II-A) under the authority of the governor to use in promoting coordination between education, employment and training, and other services.

The State Education Coordination and Grants set-aside represents an unprecedented opportunity for the states, not only to foster coordination but to do so in accordance with their own priorities. While CETA had also set aside funds to support coordination activities, the funds had been divided among four separate Governor's Grants: 1%, Education Linkages; 4%, Coordination and Special Services; 5%, Youth Services, and 6%, Supplemental Vocational Education Assistance. While the governor could direct the disbursement of three of these, their fragmentation lessened their effectiveness as a means to foster coordination on a statewide basis. Furthermore, the state had very limited authority over the disbursement of the largest of

the Governor's Grants, the 6% set-aside. CETA specifically allocated the 6% set-aside to the state's vocational education agency or department, which then distributed the funds by formula to local prime sponsors.

By replacing the several CETA Governor's Grants with a single fund, the framers of JTPA have provided the states with a more flexible, manageable tool for the planning and advancement of coordination activities. In addition, the governor has greater latitude in the disbursement of the funds since none of the set-aside is directed to a specific agency.

The rich promise of the JTPA 8% set-aside, combined with the need for information on its application, prompted the preparation of this paper. It is intended primarily for state policymakers involved in the development of policy and programming for use of the set-aside.

Relying on information from the early 8% experience of a dozen states, the paper focuses on issues related to 8% management, goals, activities, and problems. The period covered was October, 1983 through June, 1984, the first official period of JTPA activity during which the basic structure for the new law was established. The first full JTPA program year begins July 1, 1984.

States were selected primarily on the basis of their size, location, and reputation for innovation in the areas of employment and education. The twelve states included in the survey are: Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon and South Carolina. Three of the states, Massachusetts, Oregon, and South Carolina, are ones in which P/PV is working with state governments to improve youth services through its demonstration, State Employment Initiatives for Youth. In Connecticut, P/PV has also been working with the state, in this case to develop and assess the state's Jobs for Connecticut Youth program.

Most of the information for this paper was gathered from November, 1983 to January, 1984. Each of the subject states received a three-page survey focusing on four major themes related to the 8% grant: administration, goals and program activity, key differences from CETA; and innovative approaches to coordination. Follow-up telephone interviews were conducted several weeks following the survey. States were contacted several more times to clarify or expand upon information. In two cases, extensive personal interviews were also conducted.

The paper is organized into eight sections. An Overview provides brief descriptions of the goals and terms of the set-aside. The next section, Agency Administration, examines the ways in which states have organized the management of the grant.

Section 3 reviews the Methods of Distribution, followed by Section 4, Target Groups, and Section 5, Program Emphases. Section 6, Problem Areas, discusses some of the difficulties states encountered in the early implementation of the 8% grant. Section 7, Effecting Coordination, describes some innovative approaches to coordination adopted by states in the sample. Section 8, the Conclusion, summarizes briefly the findings of our survey. Finally Section 9, State Profiles, highlights 8% policy and programming in each of the survey states.

This paper is one in a series of monographs on state youth education and employment issues, sponsored by The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation to provide decision-makers with information on policy and program initiatives. The other papers still available in the series are:

A Guide to National Organizations Engaged in State Youth Education and Employment and Employment Activities (Working Paper #1), compiled by Susan M. Christian; and

The California Conservation Corps: A Case Study (Working Paper #5), by Michael A. Bailin and Natalie Jaffe

1. OVERVIEW

Under JTPA, the governor must use eight percent (8%) of the state's Title II-A allocation (Training for Disadvantaged Youth and Adults) to promote coordination among job training and employment, education, and needed support services. The law contains relatively few prescriptions concerning the oversight and use of the new set-aside.

Administration of the grant must be located with "any state education agency responsible for education and training." The results of our survey reflected the numerous possibilities: agencies of higher education, secondary education, vocational education, and employment and training. Four of our sample states have designated a department or board of education alone to administer the 8% grant; two, a department or board of vocational education; and four, a department of employment and training. In two cases, the responsibility is shared by two state units: a department or board of education and the entity that oversees the community college system.

The 8% set-aside is divided into two portions: the larger 80 percent must be used to support education and training services, which are developed through cooperative agreements among the state education agency, local SDA entities and, in some cases, local education agencies. To encourage collaboration among service providers, these funds must be matched with cash contributions, equipment, services, or supplies from an agency other than the recipient of the grant. JTPA identifies over thirty allowable services, including job-search assistance, skills training, dissemination of information on programs, supportive services, and remediation.

The remaining 20 percent of the grant may be used to provide technical assistance, professional development, job placement, counseling and curriculum development in support of coordination activities. Given these basic parameters, the governor has authority to select the appropriate state agency to manage the 8% program, the kinds of services it will support, participants who will be served, and distribution of funding to local areas.

2. AGENCY ADMINISTRATION

In one-half of our sample, the governor has chosen to lodge primary responsibility for 8% administration with the state's department of education. Significantly, in three of these cases, that responsibility has been further delegated to the sub-unit responsible for the state's vocational education policy and programming. In another two states, a separate department of vocational education is responsible for administration; and finally, in four states, or one-third of our sample, a department of employment and training oversees the set-aside. Viewed another way, state vocational education sub-units or departments control most of the 8% funding in five out of twelve cases; public secondary education in three cases; and employment and training interests in four. (Table 1 illustrates those agencies with responsibility for 8% administration by state.)

TABLE 1

8% AGENCY ADMINISTRATION

	Department of Education		State Board of Community Coll.	Dept. of Voc. Ed.	Dept. of E&T
	Second. Ed	Voc. Ed.			
Connecticut		X			
Illinois		X	(x)		
Indiana				X	
Kentucky					X
Maryland	X		(x)		
Massachusetts					X
Minnesota				X	
New Jersey					X
New York	X				
North Carolina	X				
Oregon		X			
South Carolina					X

X - Agency with primary JTPA 8% responsibility

(x) - Agency with shared, but secondary responsibilty

The dominant role played by vocational education in the oversight of 8% appears to be largely a legacy of CETA. Under CETA, the 6% set-aside for supplemental vocational education was, with few exceptions, allocated to the state's vocational education department or division. Not surprisingly, many of these same agencies have looked to the 8% as a replacement of sorts for CETA's 6% set-aside. Based on our sample, it appears that they have been fairly successful in assuming control of the 8% set-aside, although not without some struggle.

In fact, the failure of JTPA to prescribe specific responsibility for administration of the 8% set-aside has led in many instances to some intense competition among state agencies. Of the dozen states surveyed, one-third acknowledged that state education agencies had competed to varying degrees for the 8% designation. The relationship between current responsibility and past experience with other set-asides is delineated in Table 2, which lists the agencies responsible for 8% administration in our sample states.

In the case of Illinois, the State Board of Education's Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education contended with the Community College Board for administrative responsibility. The former had overseen the 6% CETA set-aside, while the latter had no experience with the Governor's discretionary funds. Eventually, a compromise divided 8% responsibility between the two, but the Board of Education's

Table 2 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JTPA 8% and CETA SET-ASIDE RESPONSIBILITIES

STATE	AGENCY WITH PRIMARY JTPA 8% RESPONSIBILITY	PRIOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR CETA 6% SET-ASIDE	PRIOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR OTHER CETA SET-ASIDES
1. Connecticut	Division of Vocational & Adult Education, Department of Education	Yes	Yes
*2. Illinois	Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education, State Board of Education	Yes	No
3. Indiana	State Board of Vocational and Technical Education	Yes	No
4. Kentucky	Department of Employment, Human Resources Cabinet	No	Yes
*5. Maryland	Division of Instruction, Department of Education	No	Yes
6. Massachusetts	Executive Office of Economic Affairs	Yes	Yes
7. Minnesota	State Board of Vocational Technical Education (prior to 1/1/84, a division of the Department of Education)	Yes	No

*In these states two agencies share the 8% responsibility, but the agency with predominant responsibility is identified.

TABLE 2 (cont.) RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JTPA 8% and CETA SET-ASIDE RESPONSIBILITIES

STATE	AGENCY WITH PRIMARY JTPA 8% RESPONSIBILITY	PRIOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR CETA 6% SET-ASIDE	PRIOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR OTHER CETA SET-ASIDE
8. New Jersey	Division of Employment and Training, Department of Labor	No	Yes
9. New York	Department of Education	Yes	No
10. North Carolina	State Board of Education (fiscal); Department of Public Instruction (program)	No	Yes
11. Oregon	Division of Vocational Education, Department of Education	Yes	No
12. South Carolina	Division of Employment and Training, Office of the Governor	No	Yes

Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education assumed the major control -- 75% of the funding for support of services. Although the role of the Community College Board is therefore limited at the state level, its nineteen colleges are very active at the local level in the delivery of training, supported by the 8% set-aside, as well as in training for dislocated workers under JTPA's Title III.

Like Illinois, Maryland has apportioned responsibility between the Department of Education and the Community College Board. In this case, the state's Division of Instruction within the Department of Education controls three-quarters of the 80 percent service funding, and the Board of Community Colleges oversees the remainder. Also like Illinois, the community college system has assumed substantial responsibility for local training activities.

In Minnesota, two subdivisions within the Department of Education vied for the 8% grant -- the Division of Vocational Education and the Education Linkage Services Unit (ELSU). The decision favored the former, but the ELSU has received some funding for programming and provision of technical assistance services.

In Connecticut, the 8% struggle involved the Department of Education, responsible for the state's elementary and secondary schools, and the Department of Higher Education, which oversees the technical and community college system. The former prevailed, primarily, it appears, because of that department's experience under CETA. The two departments will work together on the planning of 8% Requests For Proposals (RFPs) and review of proposals although the Department of Higher Education has a subordinate role.

3. METHODS OF DISTRIBUTION

As previously discussed, states are required to use the 8% grant for two distinct purposes. At LEAs 80 percent of the grant must directly support education and training services to clients eligible for assistance under JTPA, and 20 percent may be used to facilitate coordination. In general, states are using the 80 percent to fund local programs and the 20 percent to cover state agency administrative costs (e.g. staff and technical assistance). States are using a variety of methods to distribute the funding for these two components.

Re: 80 percent

The sample states are relying on four methods to distribute their service monies: competitive Request for Proposals (RFPs); allocation by needs-based formulas; sole-source contracting; and last, a mix of RFP, allocation, and/or sole-source contracting. Three of our sample states, Connecticut, Kentucky and Oregon, have distributed all their 80 percent monies through an RFP process. Four states, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina, have allocated their service portions according to needs-based formulas. South Carolina alone has chosen to distribute its 80 percent money only through sole-source

agreements with other agencies. Maryland, Massachusetts and Minnesota are distributing a portion of the monies through RFP and a portion through direct allocation to local areas. Illinois is relying on a combination of RFP, direct allocation and sole-source contracting. The methods of distribution are shown on Table 3.

Generally, state 8% agencies that rely on RFPs do so because it gives them more direct control over the use of the monies. In the typical RFP process, the 8% administering agency issues a formal solicitation, inviting service providers to apply for support of specific projects aimed at target populations. The RFP is accompanied by a number of requirements that bidders must meet to be eligible. Submissions are reviewed and evaluated by the agency, and grants awarded for the "best projects," according to criteria developed by the agency.

The RFP process has a couple of serious drawbacks. Because the process is selective, it is difficult to manage a distribution of 8% resources that ensures some funding to all needy areas. In addition, the RFP process is far more time-consuming than direct allocation. The process can span several months from the development of RFPs to the awarding of contracts.

Connecticut sent out RFPs to all the state's public education agencies, both secondary and post-secondary. According to a planner with the State Department of Education, the RFP process

TABLE 3

80 PERCENT DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES

	REP	Formula Allocation	Sole-Source	Mix
Connecticut	X			
Illinois				X (RFP, Formula, Sole Source)
Indiana		X		
Kentucky	X			
Maryland				X (RFP & Formula)
Massachusetts				X (RFP & Formula)
Minnesota				X (RFP & Formula)
New Jersey		X		
New York		X		
North Carolina		X		
Oregon	X			
South Carolina			X	

was used because the state wished to control the focus of the 8% activity. Kentucky has also acknowledged that it is using the RFP process to concentrate funding on priorities determined by the state. For Oregon, one of the key advantages of the RFP process is that the state can request proposals from service providers who would not be involved through needs-based allocation or sole-source contracting.

Under the allocation process, money is distributed to Service Delivery Areas (SDAs) or local education agencies (LEAs) according to an objectively determined, needs-based formula. The funds are distributed as soon as the 8% agency approves a plan or an application for funding. The terms for approval may be quite specific, but localities are virtually assured a set level of funding once they have successfully met those terms.

In the case of North Carolina, for example, funding has been extended to the state's seventy-three LEAs to operate two specific types of projects, both of which address the school dropout problem. New York's Department of Education has identified three priorities for use of local service funds: basic skills instruction, vocational education, and activities to aid youth in the school-to-work transition. Within these parameters, the Department of Education and the local grant recipients -- SDA/PIC or regional economic centers -- have prepared "negotiated agreements," setting down detailed plans for the use of the funds. In contrast to these highly focused approaches, New

Jersey has identified twelve very broad areas for which SDAs can use the 80 percent service monies.

Using a different procedure, South Carolina has distributed its 80 percent service monies among several state agencies through sole source agreements. As under CETA, this state has funded selected agencies to undertake specific project activities.

Under the "mix" approach, the state agency administering the 8% set-aside distributes a portion of the service monies to local areas and retains the remainder for RFP and/or sole-source contracting. This method satisfies the state's desire to focus service monies on state priorities while it ensures some minimal level of funding to all local areas. Massachusetts has allocated two-thirds of its service monies to SDAs while the state's Executive Office of Economic Affairs and the Department of Education have made the remaining one-third available to PICs through RFPs. As explained in its Coordination and Special Services Plan, the Commonwealth apportioned service monies in this way to stabilize local education programs during the 1984 transition period and to encourage simultaneously the development of new and innovative programs.

In Maryland, about $1 million (92 percent of the 80 percent) has been allocated to the state's 24 LEAs and 17 community colleges, with another $105,000 distributed by RFP to 5 demonstration projects: three school-to-work transition programs, one program providing employment development for youth in correctional institutions, and one program promoting career information services in libraries. Minnesota has chosen to allocate $1.35 million to SDAs and to send out RFPs for another $150,000 to support a range of services throughout the state.

Finally, in Illinois the State Board of Education, which controls three-fourths of the 8% grant, has distributed about three-fifths by RFP, one-fifth by direct allocation to SDAs, and one-fifth to continued support of ongoing programs. The Illinois Community College Board, responsible for the remaining one-quarter of the 8% grant, has allocated four-fifths of its share to the state's thirty-nine community colleges and the remaining one-fifth through RFPs issued to the community colleges.

Re: 20 percent

This component of the 8% grant is designated for support of coordination activities rather than direct service. Largely at their own discretion, 8% agencies are using these funds primarily for administrative purposes (often support of staff) and

technical assistance. A summary of these distribution methods is provided in Table 4.

Seven of the states in our survey -- Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oregon, and South Carolina -- have used the 20% funding exclusively for these purposes. The remaining five states are using a small portion to support coordination activities at the local level. Kentucky is funding projects that provide job training in new and expanding industry "as the opportunity arises." Massachusetts has issued local grants to SDAs and PICs for program development. It is also supporting a state Partnership Office to provide technical assistance and to operate as a clearinghouse on model programs.

New Jersey is issuing a joint RFP through the Departments of Education and Higher Education to local education agencies for projects that "will facilitate and act as a catalyst for institutional changes." About one-half of the 20 percent portion will be used for these projects. In New York, about $100,000 of the state's 20 percent ($1.6 million) will be awarded through RFPs to education agencies and other providers of social services for projects that enhance exchange of labor information, use technology in the provision of employment services, or link 8% funds with other related funds for local comprehensive services.

TABLE 4

20 PERCENT DISTRIBUTION PROCEDURES

	Retained for State Agency Administration	RFP	Selective Grants
Connecticut	X		
Illinois	X	X	X
Indiana	X		
Kentucky	X		X
Maryland	X		
Massachusetts	X		X
Minnesota	X		
New Jersey	X	X	
New York	X	X	
North Carolina	X		
Oregon	X		
South Carolina	X		

In Illinois, the State Board of Education is using about 40 percent of these funds for public/private partnership programs that promote the sharing of resources between education agencies and employers in the private sector. Other activities supported by the 20 percent portion are career guidance centers, professional development, and interagency coordination. The state's Community College Board is using close to half of its 20 percent funding to support business assistance centers in six community colleges.

4. TARGET POPULATION

Those eligible for 8% services include economically disadvantaged youth and adults and nine categories of persons with "special needs": handicapped, public assistance recipients, offenders, individuals with limited proficiency in spoken English, displaced homemakers, teenage parents, dropouts, chemical dependents, and veterans. Under the law, states may choose to "target" funding to any of these groups according to state priorities. Table 5 summarizes our sample states' choices for both target populations and program emphases.

Four of our sample states, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota and New Jersey, have not targeted a specific population beyond the terms of JTPA, leaving the responsibility for selection of special-needs groups with local areas. For the remaining two-thirds of our sample, youth are a clear priority. North Carolina is using all of its service monies, $2.16 million, to fund school-based programs serving dropouts or potential dropouts, 16-21 years old, who are economically disadvantaged and/or handicapped. Between three to four thousand youth will be served during the 1983-84 school year. Maryland has allotted over 90 percent, or $1.2 million, of its service monies for

TABLE 5

STATE	TARGET POPULATION	PROGRAM EMPHASES
Connecticut	Per legislation	Basic skills; cooperative programs; job training for high-demand occupations; employability skills; comprehensive assessment; (3/4 of service funding to secondary schools; 1/4 to post-secondary)
Illinois	Per legislation	Training for new and expanding industries; coop. ed. for dropouts; work experience and career explor.; pre-employ. prep.; business assist. centers; scholarships for hi-tech training; adult employment
Indiana	Per legislation	Vocational education; adult basic education
Kentucky	Dropouts; handicapped; offenders, including juvenile delinq.; wards of state; mentally retarded	Dropout prevention; adult literacy; training for special populations; training for new and expanding industry
Maryland	In-school youth, 16-21 yrs., who face serious barriers to employment	Assessment; basic education skills counseling; special support; skills training; school-to-work transition
Massachusetts	Disadvantaged youth; dropouts; AFDC recipients	Dropout prevention; business/school partnerships; adult literacy

TABLE 5

STATE	TARGET POPULATION	PROGRAM EMPHASES
Minnesota	Per legislation	Full range of educational services (as specified in JTPA)
New Jersey	Per legislation	12 broad areas
New York	Dropouts; educationally deficient; limited English-speaking; disadvantaged unemployed, including those in need of retraining; handicapped	Basic skills; voc. ed. training; school-to-work transition for handicapped youth
North Carolina	Dropouts and potential dropouts, including handicapped	Dropout prevention
Oregon	Per legislation	Customized training for new and expanding industries; youth training and support; other training and pre-vocational services
South Carolina	Populations under supervision of the state, including adult and youthful offenders; educationally dis-advantaged youth	Basic skills; occupational training; remediation for high school youth

educational services to in-school youth, 16-21 years old, "who face serious barriers to employment." In Massachusetts, the Commonwealth has issued an RFP, representing one-third of the service portion, to fund projects for young persons who are economically and/or educationally disadvantaged (AFDC recipients are the other target group under this RFP). New York has earmarked 15 percent of its 80 percent monies for the support of school-to-work programs for handicapped youth. In addition, the state has urged each SDA to devote 40-67 percent of the basic skills instruction supported by 8% funding to needy youth, particularly those on public assistance or under public guardianship. High school dropouts and youthful offenders are the targets of Kentucky's 8% grant. South Carolina is focusing on two groups of clients: educationally disadvantaged, in-school youth and youth under the supervision of the state, a great majority of whom are incarcerated or on probation.

In another two states, Connecticut and Oregon, youth are a clear focus of the state's service activities even though they have not been specifically targeted. Three-fourths of Connecticut's service programs are under the management of the state's secondary public education agencies, and almost forty percent of Oregon's services are related to youth employment training and support.

5. PROGRAM EMPHASES

Not surprisingly, we found that three-fourths of our sample states have identified youth education services -- primarily those aimed at improving basic skills, easing the school-to-work transition, and dropout prevention -- as a major focus of 8% programming. Dropout prevention was specificially mentioned by one-third of our sample: Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and North Carolina. In the case of North Carolina, dropout prevention is the exclusive focus of service activity. School-to-work transition is a priority for Maryland and New York; and basic education skills/remediation, for Connecticut, Maryland, New York and South Carolina. Primarily through such activities as skills training, training for new and expanding industries, and customized training, economic development is another major focus of 8% monies for five of our states: Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, New York and Oregon.

Despite the flexibility inherent in the grant, states have not used 8% funds to undertake a lot of new programming. The great majority of activities existed prior to JTPA, supported by one (or several) of the CETA set-asides, prime sponsors, the Vocational Education Act, or other sources. This is in part because, during the planning peirod for JTPA, state planners were

occupied with organizational and management issues surrounding the 8% set-aside and did not have much time to give to programmatic concerns. Hence, most states chose to stick with existing programs, at least for the short term.

A number of states are planning significant programmatic changes in the 1984 program year, which begins on July 1. Two states, Massachusetts and Indiana, discussed planned changes at the time of the survey. Massachusetts will issue RFPs for all of its 8% monies to support three types of projects: those aimed at dropout prevention, school-to-work transition programs, and business/school partnerships. Initially, Massachusetts allocated two-thirds of the 8% grant to local school systems to support the continuation of education services and issued RFPs for the remaining one-third toward the goals mentioned above. Indiana funded SDAs to provide vocational training and adult basic education services for the JTPA transition period, October, 1983 - June, 1984. The state intends to focus 1984's grant more specifically on four "initiative areas."

Despite the continuity in programming from CETA to JTPA, a couple of states did report a marked shift in emphasis. Both Illinois and Kentucky indicated that remediation and youth education services were not previously priorities for the state.

6. PROBLEM AREAS

Almost unanimously, state planners felt that the amount of time allotted for the CETA-JTPA transition period was insufficient. In most states, the changeover involved substantial adjustments in the organization of their employment and training systems, as well as the development of new policies and procedures. As illustrated by Table 6, five of the survey states undertook a major reorganization of their employment and training operations. Even for those states that did not experience overt administrative adjustments, the new legislation undoubtedly prompted a number of changes in agency roles and staffing.

Thus, for state JTPA planners, the 8% grant represented a small, relatively minor piece of the large JTPA puzzle. Decisions about 8% policy and programs had to await the resolution of a number of major issues related to the state's overall JTPA policy and management. Once these large questions were addressed, 8% goals and activities could be planned, but the entire process was very time-consuming for most states. State planners had to designate administrative responsibilities, formulate plans, establish priorities and targets, disseminate information to local areas, and make decisons about project

TABLE 6

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES
PROMPTED BY JTPA

STATE	JTPA ADMINISTRATION CHANGE
Connecticut	o Dissolution of the Division of Employment and Training within Gov's Office of Policy and Management o Transfer of federal E&T responsibility to Dept. of Labor
Illinois	None
Indiana	None
Kentucky	None
Maryland	o Establishment of a new Dept. of Employment and Training to oversee JTPA
Massachusetts	o Dissolution of Dept. of Manpower Development within Executive Office of Economic Affairs (EOEA) o Establishment of Office of Training and Employment Policy within EOEA to oversee federal E&T policy o Establishment of Partnership Office to provide technical assistance
Minnesota	o Establishment of a separate Dept. of Vocational Education, previously a sub-unit of Dept. of Education.
New Jersey	None
New York	None
North Carolina	None
Oregon	o Establishment of a sub-unit of Job Development and Training Services, within Division of Vocational Education, to handle JTPA 8% and Vocational Education disadvantaged and handicapped grants.
South Carolina	None

funding. For states issuing RFPs, the process was even more complex.

With the exception of North Carolina, all of the survey states experienced delays in the implementation of their 8% projects. Partial implementation was underway in four of our states in October, the official beginning of the JTPA transition period, and in November in a fifth; but even in these states the bulk of project activity did not begin for some months. In three states, 8% activity did not begin until January. In another four, February was the first month. Table 7 summarizes the timeframe in each state for project implementation.

In the case of North Carolina, 8% activity began "on schedule" in October, 1983. This state avoided the delay for two reasons: the 8% agency designation was made in June, 1983, relatively early in the process, and the state chose to limit project activity to two statewide education programs that had already been operating for several years under CETA.

Overcoming CETA "mindsets" was another frequently mentioned problem. Most of our respondents felt that the many new relationships being created between education and training interests through the 8% set-aside were long overdue improvements. They cautioned, however, that time and practice were still needed before significant "working" cooperation could

TABLE 7

8% PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

STATE	BEGINNING		END
	1983	1984	1984
Connecticut		February	September
Illinois	November	May	June
Indiana		Febrary/March	September
Kentucky		January	June
Maryland		January April (RFPs)	June June
Massachusetts	October	February	September
Minnesota		February	September
New Jersey		February Summer (RFPs)	June September
New York		January April (RFPs)	June September
North Carolina	October		June
Oregon	October	January	June - September
South Carolina	October	Spring	Summer

take effect. Overcoming past practices and relationships would not happen overnight, no matter how effective the new mechanisms for cooperation.

7. EFFECTING COORDINATION

Under the terms of the 8% grant, the various service activities funded with the 80 percent portion must be supported by agreements of cooperation between the state's 8% agency, the local SDA administrative entity, and, where appropriate, local education agencies (LEAs). These written agreements are the legislation's vehicle for instituting ongoing cooperation. Beyond these formal agreements, however, several of the survey states have developed additional ways to foster coordination between education, employment and training, and support services. These innovations are described briefly below to illustrate the variety of approaches that have been prompted by the 8% grant.

-- New York is using a network of Regional Education Centers for Economic Development, originally established in 1976, to serve as the coordinating links between local public education agencies and business communities. Supported with funding from both the Vocational Education Act and JTPA 8%, the Centers were created to help educational agencies develop programs that meet regional economic development needs. With JTPA support, the Centers help SDAs develop services that will be eligible for 8% funds; participate in the development and review of 8% RFPs; participate in the selection of service providers; and assist educational institutions in the design of training programs that can be funded through JTPA.

-- North Carolina has established local Collaborative Committees in each of its seventy-three school districts to monitor the state's dropout prevention programs, which are supported by the JTPA 8% grant.

The committees are composed of local business and industry representatives, local school personnel, Employment Security Commission staff, and community leaders.

-- Both Connecticut and Maryland have required that LEAs must be the fiscal agents for all 8% service projects, thereby ensuring education's particpation in local 8% activities.

-- Maryland has designated key staff in each of the state's 17 school districts to help with the development and oversight of 8% projects.

-- Massachusetts has established the Partnership Office, a sub-unit of the Department of Manpower Development, to further collaborative efforts by providing a broad range of technical assistance to SDAs, PICs and LEAs. The Office also serves as a clearinghouse for information on model programs.

-- Massachusetts has also given PICs the central role in bringing together education, employment and training, and business interests in the planning and oversight of local employment and training activities. This conforms to its goal of establishing PICs as "the foundation" of the Commonwealth's employment and training system.

8. CONCLUSION

In the nine-month period that we examined, states were primarily adjusting to JTPA. The sample states did not, for the most part, initiate a lot of new program activity with their 8% grants, but rather were working out organizational and administrative arrangements to accommodate the 8% grant as well as other facets of the new law. In fact, a number of states indicated that they were looking to the first "full" program year, beginning July 1, 1984, to launch new programs. They used the period from October, 1983 to June, 1984 to establish the necessary administrative structure through which programs would be developed.

We were able to identify the following trends:

- The designation of the appropriate state agency to manage the grant was not an easy matter. Under CETA, discretionary funding for educational and employment and training services had been a reliable source of funding for a number of state agencies to support staff and a variety of program activities. With JTPA, these agencies were faced with a dramatic change in the administration and distribution of the discretionary monies. This fact, combined with the general reduction in federal employment and education funding available to states, often resulted in a scramble for the control of the 8% grant.

- A major portion of services funded through the 8% set-aside are helping youth, particularly those who have dropped out of school or are likely to do so.

- o The service emphasis appears to be fairly equally divided between services for education and those for training, although the emphasis varies considerably by state.

Whether the grant has enhanced coordination as it was intended remains to be seen. Although a number of states had developed some promising appproaches for forging new relationships between education and employment and training agencies, most planners observed that significant change would not happen for several months and more.

9. STATE PROFILES

Connecticut

With the advent of JTPA, this state undertook a major reorganization of its employment and training system, transferring responsibility for implementation of federal employment and training policy from a division within the Governor's Office of Policy and Management to the state's Department of Labor.

Administration of the 8% grant now rests with the Department of Education's Division of Vocational and Adult Education (DVAE) -- a designation that was not formalized until October, 1983. In the development of 8% policy and projects, DVAE is working with the Department of Higher Education (DHE), which oversees the state's system of universities, community colleges and technical colleges. As a state education agency, DHE was a contender for control of the 8% monies at one time. The designation went to DVAE largely as a consequence of its experience under CETA in the administration of the governor's discretionary funds. DVAE had overseen the distribution of the Governor's 6% Supplemental Vocational Education Assistance Grant, the 5% Youth Services Grant, and a portion of the 4% Coordination, and Special Services Grant. In contrast, DHE was never involved with CETA at the state level, although many of DHE's local institutions ran projects supported by CETA through contracts with local prime sponsors.

All of Connecticut's service monies have been distributed through an RFP process to a range of educational agencies and institutions, such as public secondary schools, regional vocational technical schools and community colleges. Non-education agencies or community-based organizations may operate projects, but they may do so only under the aegis of an education agency. According to a DVAE planner, the RFP method of distribution is being used because it gives the Division more direct control over the use of funds than it would have under an allocation process. Under CETA, a significant portion of the discretionary funds, including the Supplemental Vocational Education Assistance 6%, were allocated by formula to local prime sponsors.

The overwhelming portion of the 80 percent service funds, 75 percent or $678,000, has been earmarked for programs in public secondary schools. The remaining one-quarter, $226,000, will support services provided by state community and technical colleges. The state has five areas of priority for service funding: 1) basic skills; 2) cooperative programs; 3) job training for high-demand occupations; 4) employability skills; and, 5) comprehensive assessment.

State	Connecticut
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Department of Labor
8%:	Division of Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education
Transition Funding (October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$14.16 million
8%:	$ 1.13 million
Target Population	As defined by JTPA
Priorities	
80%:	Basic skills; cooperative programs; job training for high-demand occupations; employability skills; comprehensive assessment.
20%:	State agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	Range of education agencies. Seventy-five percent of service funding to public secondary schools; twenty five percent to post-secondary schools.
Method of Distribution	
80%:	RFP ($50,000 limit/proposal)
20%:	Retained for state agency administration
Significant Changes	More extensive use of RFP providing greater state control of discretionary funding; Transfer of employment and training responsibility from a division within Governor's Office of Policy and Management to Department of Labor

Connecticut

Distinctive Features	RFP distributed only to local public schools, requiring that schools be fiscal agents for all 8% projects.
Project Period	Mid-February through September, 1984

Illinois

The state's Department of Commerce and Community Affairs is responsible for the overall administration of Illinois' JTPA program. In the case of the 8% set-aside, the Illinois Board of Education's Department of Adult Vocational and Technical Education has responsibility for three-fourths of the grant and the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) for the remaining one-quarter. The first agency had administered the 6% vocational education set-aside under CETA, while the second had no experience in the management of the governor's discretionary funding. The 8% grant is supporting much of the same activity as the CETA set-asides, particularly the 6% vocational education grant.

The Board of Education is distributing about 60 percent of its share by RFP and 20 percent by direct allocation to SDAs. The remaining 20 percent of the Board of Education's share will be subcontracted on a "sole source" basis to support model projects that relate directly to the Governor's Education for Employment Program. The Program sets forth five areas of activity, designed to prepare Illinois students for the workforce of the future. They are: improving math and science literacy; more relevant job training; expanding student loans; increased emphasis on engineering education; and funding for elementary/ secondary schools.

The 80 percent service activities supported by the Board of Education include career counseling and placement for disadvantaged high school youth, industrial-based education and training (with emphasis on those for new and expanding industry), cooperative education for dropouts, and work experience. Most of these directly benefit youth.

The Community College Board has focused its portion of the 80 percent service monies on economic development programs. Accordingly, its projects include high technology training, adult employment development, and an economic opportunity set-aside. A significant portion, about four-fifths, of the funds have been allocated to commmunity colleges upon submission of a request for allocation (RFA). The remaining portion has been distributed by RFP to community colleges.

Of the 20 percent of the set-aside designated for coordination activities, the State Board of Education is using a substantial portion, 40 percent of its share, for administration. Another 40 percent is being used to support public/private partnership programs that encourage the sharing of resources such as staff, facilities, and equipment between education agencies and employers in the private sector. The remaining portion of the 20 percent funds is supporting career guidance centers, professional development, and interagency coordination. About half of the Community College Board's 20 percent funding is

supporting administrative costs. The remaining half has been awarded through an RFP process to six community colleges to support business assistance centers.

State	Illinois
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Department of Commerce & Community Affairs
8%:	Shared by: o Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) (75%), Department of Adult Vocational & Technical Education o Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) (25%)
Transition Funding (October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$74.7 million
8%:	$ 6.0 million, of which $ 4.5 million to ISBE $ 1.5 million to ICCB
Target Population	As defined by JTPA
Priorities	
80%:	ISBE: training for new and expanding industry; assessment; coop. educ. for dropouts; work experience career exploration; pre-employment preparation; ICCB training: hi-tech training; comprehensive adult employment develop; economic opportunity set-aside
20%:	ISBE: public/private partnership; occupational information coordination; state agency administration ICCB: business assistance centers; state agency administration
Eligible Recipients	Public and private education agencies, community organizations, business and industry.

Illinois

Method of Distribution

Mix of formula allocation, RFP, and sole-source contracting

80%: ISBE: Approximately 20% distributed by formula to SDAs; another 60% by RFPs; remaining 20% sole-source contracted for specific projects related to Gov's Education for Employment program.
ICCB: Approximately 80% distributed by formula allocation to community college districts, and remaining 20% by RFPs.

20%: ISBE: sole-source contracting; RFPs; retained for state agency administration.
ICCB: RFP to community colleges; retained for state agency administration

Significant Changes

- o Broader education and youth focus
- o Involvement of state's community college board.

Distinctive Features

Use of 8% to support the Governor's Education for Employment program

Project Period

November, 1983 - May 1 through June 30, 1984

Indiana

Continuing a tradition that began under CETA, a "partnership" of state agencies - the Office of Occupational Development, the State Board of Vocational and Technical Education, Vocational Rehabilitation Services, and the Department of Commerce - has been meeting regularly over the last couple of years to plan JTPA policy and programming. The administrative responsibility for overall JTPA planning and program implementation resides with the Office of Occupational Development, the agency that was also largely responsible for state activities under CETA. The State Board of Vocational and Technical Education (SBVTE) administers the 8% grant.

The 80 percent service funds have been distributed to SDAs according to an "agreement of need" among SBVTE, the SDA administrative entity, and, where appropriate, LEAs and other providers of educational services. "Need" is based on the level of resources available for vocational education and adult basic education. The service monies are generally being used for the expansion and improvement of 1) vocational education and/or 2) adult basic education programs. The state has not identified any projects as priorities or targeted specific client populations, leaving with local SDAs the responsibility for fashioning programs appropriate to their own needs and priorities. For the program year beginning July 1, 1984, the state intends to focus the 8% grant more specifically on three or four "initiative areas."

State	Indiana
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Office of Occupational Development
8%:	State Board of Vocational & Technical Education
Transition Funding (October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$38.4 million
8%:	$ 3.1 million
Target Population	
	As defined by JTPA
Priorities	
80%:	Vocational education and adult basic education services
20%:	State agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	Service Delivery Areas
Method of Distribution	
80%:	Formula allocation to SDA's based on "need" for vocational education and adult basic education services
20%:	Retained for state agency administration
Project Period	
	February-March, 1984 through September 30, 1984

Kentucky

The Department of Employment Services (DES), a division of the Human Resources Cabinet, is responsible for the state's overall JTPA policy and mangement, as well as for the 8% grant. Under CETA, DES played the key role in the oversight of the Governor's set-asides, the 1%, 4% and 5%. The 6% set-aside for vocational education was passed on by DES to the Department of Education for further allocation to local prime sponsors. An education task force, formed in early 1983, has developed policy guidelines for the use of the 8% monies.

Kentucky is focusing about one-half ($1 million) of its 80 percent portion on services in two areas of statewide need: dropout prevention and adult literacy. RFPs for the use of the 80 percent monies were sent to about 175 potential providers -- a range of public and private agencies. Through this process, the state awarded funds to about 100 programs, which were to operate from early 1984 through June. The 20 percent portion will be used to support training for new and expanded industry.

For DES planners, the JTPA 8% grant provides the state with the opportunity to concentrate resources on priorities established by the state, such as remedial education. By distributing funds through an RFP process, the state has been able to define the kinds of projects funded within SDAs. Under

CETA, the majority of funding through the set-asides had been allocated directly to prime sponsors for a variety of uses with only a small portion distributed through RFPs.

State	Kentucky
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Department of Employment Services, Human Resources Cabinet
8%:	Department of Employment Services, Human Resources Cabinet
Transition Funding (October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$25.8 million
8%:	$ 2.1 million
Target Population	
	High school dropouts, handicapped, offenders, juvenile delinquents, wards of the state, mentally retarded
Priorities	
80%:	Dropout prevention: adult literacy; training for special populations
20%:	Training for new and expanding industry
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	Range of public and private agencies
Method of Distribution	
80%:	RFP
20%:	Selective grants; retained for state agency administration
Significant Changes	
	Increased state focus on remediation and youth services
Project Period	
	January, 1984 through June 30, 1984

Maryland

Following the passage of JTPA, the state established a new Department of Employment and Training, which centralized responsibilities that had been performed by several state units under CETA. The Department has chosen to distibute the 80 percent service funding to two state education agencies: the Division of Instruction (DI) within the Department of Education, which controls about three-fourths of the 80 percent portion, and the State Board of Community Colleges, which oversees the remaining one-quarter. DI is focusing its portion of the funds on educational services for disadvantaged 16-21-year-olds. About two-thirds, or $945,000, have been allocated to the state's twenty-four school districts, which were required to apply for the money according to terms established by DI. The remaining $105,000 that DI controls has been distributed through an RFP process to support five specific demonstration projects: three, providing school-to-work assistance; one, providing employment development for inmates of correctional institutions; and one supporting career information services in libraries.

The State Board of Community Colleges will distribute $350,000 of the service funds to the state's seventeen community colleges for career planning courses.

A source within the Division of Instruction is optimistic that the JTPA 8% will prompt improved coordination between schools and employment and training agencies. Under CETA, the state's school districts were not involved regularly in the development or operation of youth education and training programs. In contrast, the state's 8% program under JTPA gives public schools a direct role in youth programming.

State	Maryland
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Department of Employment & Training (DET)
8%:	Shared by: o Division of Instruction (DI) (67%), Departmemt of Education o State Board of Community Colleges
Transition Funding (October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$22.7 million
8%:	$ 1.8 million, of which $ 1.2 million to DI $ .45 million to SBCC $ .15 million to Dept of E&T
Target Population	
	DI: 16-21 year olds, in school youth who face serious barriers to employment SBCC: economically disadvantaged
Priorities	
80%:	DI allocation: assessment; basic education; skills training; counseling; referral; placement; outreach; special support; DI RFP: school to work transition SBCC: career planning
20%:	DI, SBCC and DET state agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
	DI: 24 local education agencies (LEAs) SBCC: 17 local community colleges
Method of Distribution	
	Mix of allocation and RFP
80%:	DI: $945,000 allocation to LEAs upon application for funding; $105,000 RFP for special demonstrations. SBCC: $350,000 allocation to community colleges
20%:	Retained for state agency demonstration

Maryland

Significant Changes

- Establishment of a state Department of Employment and Training
- Enhanced role of education at state and local level in employment and training policy

Project Period

LEA allocation: January 1, 1984 through June 30, 1984
RFP: April, 1984 through June 30, 1984

Massachusetts

The Commonwealth's Executive Office of Economic Affairs (EOEA) has overall responsibility for JTPA implementation. This office is newly established, replacing the Department of Manpower Development, which oversaw state CETA activity.

To develop guidelines for the use of the state's 8% grant, the EOEA and the Department of Education established the Education Task Force in June, 1983. The final plan is based largely on the Task's Force's recommendations. EOEA is distributing the 80 percent service funds in two ways: close to two-thirds have been disbursed by formula to SDAs to ensure the continuance of education programs during the transition year; the remaining one-third of the grant has been distributed by RFP to Private Industry Councils to encourage the development of three types of model or innovative programs: business/school partnerships, adult basic education programs, and those aimed at high school dropouts. To qualify, these programs must serve disadvantaged youth, high school dropouts or AFDC recipients. By restricting the RFPs for the 8% to PICs only, the Commonwealth's planners intend to establish PICs as the focal point for local collaborative planning.

Massachusetts is using a portion of its 20 percent funding to support local program development through small grants to PICs. The state's newly created Partnership Office is also receiving 20

percent support to provide technical assistance to localities and to develop a clearinghouse of model programs and other information related to 8% activity.

State	Massachusetts
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Executive Office of Economic Affairs (EOEA)
8%:	EOEA, with Department of Education assisting in RFP process
Transition Funding	
(October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$29.3 million
8%:	$ 2.3 million
Target Population	
	Disadvantaged youth, dropouts, AFDC recipients
Priorities	
80%:	Business/school partnerships; adult literacy; dropout prevention
20%:	State agency administration (including Partnership Office); local grants for cooperative agreements
Eligible Recipients	
SDAs:	formula allocation
PICs:	RFP
Method of Distribution	
80%:	Mix of formula allocation and RFP: 2/3 formula allocation to SDAs 1/3 RFP to PICs (By 1985 intend to RFP all of 80%)
20%:	Selective grants; retained for state agency administration
Significant Changes	
	Shift of employment and training responsibility to EOEA
	Enhanced role of PICs

Massachusetts

Distinctive Features

- Emphasis on PICs to effect comprehensive planning and coordination of services at local level
- Establishment of state Partnership Office to provide technical assistance

Project Period

October, 1983 - February through September 30, 1984

Minnesota

The Governor's Job Training Office (GJTO) of the Department of Economic Security oversees the state's JTPA program. The 8% Education and Coordination Grant is administered by the Department of Vocational Education (DVE), with the assistance of GJTO. DVE is a new state department, created in January, 1984. Most of its activities were previously carried out by the Department of Education's Division of Vocational and Technical Education (DVTE). Under CETA, DVTE was responsible for the allocation of the vocational education set-aside to prime sponsors.

The designation of DVTE (now DVE) as administrator of the 8% set-aside was not without controversy. Also in contention for that responsiblity was the Educational Linkages Unit, another subagency within the Department of Education. The Linkages Unit had played an important role under CETA, involving local education agencies in prime-sponsor planning and program development by prime sponsors. Based on this experience, the Unit seemed to be an appropriate choice for the 8% responsibility. Although its role under JTPA has been reduced, the Unit will continue to provide technical assistance and some training with the support of 20 percent funding.

The Department of Vocational Education has allocated $1.05 million of its 80 percent funds by formula to SDA administrative

entities for the broad range of services permissable under JTPA. The remaining $150,000 of the service funds supports projects selected through an RFP process that was aimed at education agencies and SDA administration entities. These projects provide a variety of education and employment services to one or more of the special-needs groups identified in JTPA. Each project is jointly sponsored by a local education agency and an SDA entity.

The 20 percent portion of the grant supports some GJTO and Department of Education staffing as well as technical assistance activity, including projects of the Educational Services Unit.

State	Minnesota
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Governor's Job Training Office (GJTO), Department of Economic Security
8%·	State Board of Vocational-Technical Education,* with cooperation of GJTO
Transition Funding	
(October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$18.7 million
8%:	$ 1.5 million
Target Population	
	As defined by JTPA
Priorities	
80%:	Joint efforts of SDAs and education providing full range of educational services
20%:	State agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	o SDAs: formula allocation o a wide range of services provided through RFP
Method of Distribution	
80%:	Mix of formula allocation and RFP: formula allocation (90%) to SDAs RFP (10%)
20%:	Retained for state agency administration
Significant Changes	
	o Establishment of a State Board of Vocational-Technical Education o Enhanced role of vocational education in employment and training policy

Minnesota

Project Period

February through September 30, 1984

*Prior to January, 1984, the Division of Vocational and Technical Education within Department of Education

New Jersey

The planning for this state's 8% grant was undertaken by the Committee of Four, a group consisting of the Chairperson of the Job Training Coordinating Council, the Commissioner of the Department of Labor, the Commissioner of the Department of Education and the Chancellor of the Department of Higher Education. By establishing this state's key education agencies and key employment and training agencies as equal partners in the planning process, the state hoped to minimize the conflict among these agencies over the use of the 8% monies. Under CETA, such an arrangement for cooperation did not exist.

The Department of Labor's Division of Employment and Training oversees the 8% grant as well as the state's other JTPA responsibilities. At the recommendations of the Committee, all of the 80 percent portion of the 8% set-aside has been allocated by the Division to local SDAs. SDAs have been instructed to focus their 8% programming on a dozen broad "priority program areas." Local education agencies from both higher education and secondary education provide most of the services designated as priorities. In fact, close to two-thirds of the SDA funds have been distributed to the schools in the higher education system. A source with the state's Department of Labor ascribes this to the fact that higher education was much more "aggressive" in contracting these services than the Department of Education.

About one-half ($500,000) of the 20 percent portion will be used to fund "innovative programs that will facilitate and act as a catalyst for institutional change." A statewide RFP process, administered jointly by the Department of Education and Higher Education, will identify these programs. The selection of projects will be made by mid to late summer. The remaining $500,000 of the 20% portion will be used for staffing and other administrative costs of the Department of Education and Higher Education.

State	New Jersey
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Division of Employment and Training, Department of Labor
8%:	Division of Employment & Training, Department of Labor
Transition Funding	
(October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$41.2 million
8%:	$ 3.3 million
Target Population	
	As defined by JTPA
Priorities	
80%:	Twelve broad priorities, including training, apprenticeship, retraining, etc.
20%:	RFPs for special innnovative activity that will advance cooperation; state agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	SDAs: formula allocation
20%:	LEAs: RFP
Method of Distribution	
80%:	Mix of allocation and RFP SDA allocation: $2.8 million
20%:	RFP administered by Department of Education and Department of Higher Education to local school districts and higher education facilities: ($500,000); $300,000 retained for agency administration.

New Jersey

Significant Changes	Establishment of a Committee of Four (Commissioners of Labor, Education, Higher Education and Chair of SJTCC to coordinate 8% planning and policy.
Distinctive Features	Committee of Four jointly responsible for the overall planning and administration of 8%.
Project Period	SDA allocations: February, 1984 through June 30, 1984 RFPs: Summer, 1984

New York

The Department of Education (DOE) has been entrusted with the administration of the 8% grant. A Management Advisory Group, comprised of representatives from a broad range of the state's education and training communities, will assist DOE in overseeing the implementation of the state's 8% activity.

DOE has allocated the 80 percent service funds to SDAs and economic development regions on the basis of a formula that takes into account employment and education needs. A small portion (ten percent) of these funds has been reserved for allocation during the program year to address emerging needs. Localities have been encouraged to focus their funding on three areas: 60 percent of funding on basic skills; 25 percent on school-to-work transition for handicapped youth; and the remaining 15 percent on vocational education training. Local service providers have been selected through an RFP process, developed and administered by the state Department of Education. DOE and the SDAs make the selections jointly.

A distinctive feature of New York's 8% strategy is the reliance on a network of ten Regional Eduation Centers for Economic Development to coordinate planning among education agencies and PIC/SDAs.

The state is using its 20 percent portion of the 8% grant, approximately $1.6 million, for three purposes: Department of Education administration and technical assistance; support of the network of ten regional centers; and grants distributed through an RFP process for innovative demonstration projects. The RFP will be distributed in late spring. Priority will be given to projects that provide labor information exchange; use technology in the provision of employment services; and link or match 8% funds with other related funds for local comprehensive services.

State	New York
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Department of Labor
8%:	Department of Education
Transition Funding	
(October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$100 million
8%:	$ 8 million
Target Population	
	Dropouts; educationally deficient; those with limited English-speaking skills; disadvantaged unemployed, including those in need of retraining; handicapped (especially young)
Priorities	
80%:	Basic skills; vocational education; school-to-work for handicapped.
20%:	Innovative demonstration projects, e.g. information labor exchange, and models that combine 8% with other funding; network of Regional Education Centers for Economic Development, state agency administration;
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	SDAs and Regional Education Centers: formula allocation
20%:	A range of service providers: RFP
Method of Distribution	
80%:	Mix of Allocation and RFP Allocation to SDA and Regional Education Centers; 10% reserved for emerging needs
20%:	RFP for innovative projects; remainder retained for state agency administration

New York

Distinctive Features

- Role of Regional Education Centers for Economic Development in effecting local coordination
- JTPA Management Advisory Group to assist Department of Education in 8% administration

Project Period

SDA allocations: January 1, 1984 through June 30, 1984

RFP: April, 1984 through September 30, 1984

North Carolina

The state's Department of Natural Resources and Community Development oversees JTPA policy and implementation, a role it also played under CETA. In an unusual arrangement, the state's Board of Education has fiscal responsibilities for the 8% grant, and the Department of Public Instruction oversees 8% programming.

Dropout prevention is the exclusive focus of this state's 8% activity. Virtually all of the state's 80 percent funding, $2.7 million, is supporting two approaches to the dropout problem. The first of these, the $1.7 million Dropout Prevention/Job Placement program, is operating in each of the state's 73 secondary school districts. The program serves 14 to 21-year-olds who are experiencing academic or other difficulties associated with a high probability of dropping out. Each center works with about 40 youth, who receive about 34 weeks of services, such as instruction in pre-employment skills, work experience (paid or unpaid), career guidance and remedial education. The level of funding that schools receive varies with "need," defined by community economic factors, unemployment levels, school dropout rates and educational resources. Each of the participating local education agencies has formed a collaborative committee for oversight, composed of representatives of the private sector and education and social services.

The Extended Day program, funded at a level of $1.4 million, helps dropouts complete their schooling. It serves young people who have dropped out of school because of financial problems or an inability to succeed in the traditional school setting. The program offers three basic services: education for employment, tryout employment, and limited work experience. Slightly less than one-third of the state's school districts have been funded. The State Department of Public Instruction based its selection of sites on the same "need" determination as the Dropout Prevention program.

State:	North Carolina
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Division of Employment and Training, Department of Natural Resources & Community Development
8%:	Shared by: o State Board of Education (fiscal responsibility) o Department of Public Instruction (program)
Transition Funding (October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A	$33.8 million
8%:	$ 2.7 million
Target Population	High school dropouts and potential dropouts (included handicapped)
Priorities	
80%:	Dropout prevention
20%:	State agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	Public school districts
Method of Distribution	
80%:	Allocation to school districts
20%:	Retained for state agency administration
Distinctive Features	Establishment of local collaborative committees
Project Period	October, 1983 - June 30, 1984

Oregon

Overall administration of JTPA in Oregon rests with the Governor's Intergovernmental Division. The Division of Vocational Education within the Department of Education is responsible for the 8% grant. This same agency also oversaw the distribution of the 6% vocational education set-aside under CETA.

A new subunit in the Division was established in October, 1983 to manage the 8% grant. Interestingly, this subunit is also responsibile for set-asides under the Vocational Education Act (VEA) for the disadvantaged and handicapped.

The 80 percent service funds have been distributed through RFPs to a wide range of providers: public and private education institutions, SDAs, social service agencies, proprietary schools, economic development organizations, business and industry, and organized labor. The projects that have been funded focus on three areas: customized training for new and expanding industry, youth training and support; and other training and prevocational preparation.

Although the nature of the projects funded with the 8% grant does not differ significantly from those funded under the CETA set-asides (notably the 6%), the process for the distribution does, with the state wielding much more control over the use of funding related to education and coordination. Unlike the 6%

vocational set-aside, the 8% money does not "automatically" go to local subgrantees. Rather, it is distributed through a competitive RFP process, in which subgrantees must address priorities and terms established by the state.

State	Oregon
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Intergovernmental Relations Division
8%:	Division of Vocational Education, Department of Education
Transition Funding	
(October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$19.1 million
8%:	$ 1.5 million
Target Population	
	As identified by JTPA
Priorities	
80%:	Customized training for new and expanding industry; (20%) youth training and support; (40%); other training (40%)
20%:	State agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	A range of public, private, and non-profit agencies
Method of Distribution	
80%:	RFP
20%:	Retained for state agency administration
Significant Changes	
	New subunit established within Division of Vocational Education to handle 8%
Distinctive Features	
	RFP combining 8% and Vocational Education Act Disadvantaged and Handicapped Funds

Oregon

Project Period

4 funding periods, beginning October, November, December, 1983, January, 1984 through September 30, 1984

South Carolina

Because this state is a single SDA, the Governor's Office of Employment and Training controls not only state-level JTPA monies but those allocated to localities as well. In other states, the employment and training agency oversees a decentralized network or system of fairly independent SDAs, each with its own system of service providers. In South Carolina, there are no local employment and training units. All policies and decisions related to employment and training are the prerogative of the state.

In view of this unusual administrative arrangment, South Carolina alone among the survey states has neither allocated nor issued RFPs for the 8% grant. Instead, it has contracted all of its 8% programming activity through sole-source agreements with other state agencies or local education units.

This state's 8% grant has been used to support two major activities. The first is a skills training and remediation project for populations under the supervision of the state. This project was funded for a number of years under CETA and benefits a variety of client groups served by the Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services, and the Department of Probation and Parole. Most of the clients are under 24 years of age. The other focus of the 8% grant has been the state's Remediation Initiative. Scheduled to begin in several school

sites in the summer of 1984, this project is aimed at helping disadvantaged high school students meet the state's recently enacted mimimum skills requirement. The Initiative will offer computer-assisted instruction to needy students in an number of school districts throughout the state. The Departments of Education and of Comprehensive and Technical Education are also participating in this project. Most of the $1.75 million of the 80 percent that has been earmarked for the Remediation Initiative has supported planning and developmental activities.

The state's 20 percent has funded staffing and other administration costs in the Department of Education, State Board of Comprehensive and Technical Education, and the Governor's Office.

State	South Carolina
Administration	
Overall JTPA:	Employment and Training Division, Office of the Governor
8%:	Employment and Training Division, Office of the Governor
Transition Funding (October 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984)	
JTPA II-A:	$21.9 million
8%:	$ 1.75 million
Target Population	Populations under the supervision of the state, including adult and youthful offenders; educationally disadvantaged youth.
Priorities	
80%:	Basic skills; occupational training; remediation initative
20%:	State agency administration
Eligible Recipients	
80%:	Local public school districts; technical colleges; correctional institutes
Method of Distribution	
80%:	Sole-source agency contracts
20%:	Retained for state agency administration
Distinctive Features	Single SDA designation places control for both state and local level funding with division of the Office of the Governor
Project Period	October, 1983 - Spring, 1984 through Summer, 1984